

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of JASMINE AH'LAEGH MARIE  
ALSTON, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TIA ALSTON,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 12, 2001

No. 231190

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-38620-NA

Before: Hood, P.J., and Whitbeck and Meter, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from an order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (3)(g) and (3)(j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (3)(g) and (3)(j). We affirm.

Respondent was in foster care when she gave birth to the minor child. The minor child was born with opiates present in her system. Respondent was allowed to take the minor child home provided that she agree to work with petitioner. The minor child was removed from respondent's care approximately three weeks after the birth. Respondent admitted that she left the minor child at the home of her foster parent. Respondent admitted that she was on probation and had a history of violence. Petitioner was unable to aid respondent despite numerous attempts. Respondent changed jobs frequently because of her hostility and inability to work with others. Respondent was dismissed from a laboratory where random urine drug screens occurred because of her "attitude" and hostility to employees. Respondent was placed in a program that provided shelter and counseling. Respondent was required to complete chores, participate in group therapy, attend school, and maintain employment. Respondent would refuse to complete her chores because of health problems or go to work because it was raining. Respondent failed to present documentation to substantiate any health problems. After a hostile exchange with employees of the program, police were called to remove respondent from the facility. Respondent's random drug screens indicated that her drug use continued. A psychological evaluation indicated that there was a high probability that respondent would engage in

“dangerous, parental behavior” based on her hostility and failure to acknowledge her problems. Respondent, on the other hand, alleged that any positive drugs screens were the result of prescription medication. Respondent did not believe that she had a hostility or aggression problem. Respondent had been attending school and was pregnant at the time of the hearing seeking termination of her parental rights. Respondent believed that there was no basis for termination. The trial court concluded that respondent had an aggression problem that she did not address and failed to participate in services to reunify with the minor child.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 352; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). There was no evidence that respondent could provide proper care and custody within a reasonable period of time considering the age of the child. Termination was required unless the court found that termination was clearly not in the child’s best interests. *Id.* at 364-365. On this record, we cannot conclude that termination was clearly not in the child’s best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Harold Hood  
/s/ William C. Whitbeck  
/s/ Patrick M. Meter